

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-8 are pending with Claims 1, 6 and 8 being independent claims.

Claims 1-8 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting (ODP) as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of Ryu et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,808,402), whose assignee is Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.

Claims 1-8 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Braxton (U.S. Pat. No. 6,134,121).

Claims 1, 6 and 8 are amended. No new subject matter is presented.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under ODP, the Examiner states that Ryu et al. renders the claim obvious. Amended Claim 1 teaches, in part, a mobile communication terminal having a hinge device for electrically connecting a main body and a folder of the terminal, the hinge device comprising a conductive hinge housing; a *conductive* coil spring; and a conductive contact pin, wherein *an electrical connection path between the main body and the folder through the hinge device includes the conductive coil spring and the conductive contact pin*.

Ryu et al. discloses a mobile communication terminal 100 having a hinge device 200 for electrically connecting a main body 110 and a folder 150 of the terminal 100, the hinge device 200 comprising a conductive hinge housing 210; a coil spring 240; and a conductive contact pin 250 (FIGs 2-4). Ryu et al. is silent about a *conductive* coil spring and about *an electrical connection path between the main body and the folder through the hinge device includes the conductive coil spring and the conductive contact pin*, the limitations taught by Amended Claim 1.

Clearly, Amended Claim 1 structurally differs from Ryu et al.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 6 under ODP, the above rationale for Amended Claim 1 also similarly applies to Amended Claim 6 with respect to Ryu et al.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 8 under ODP, the above rationale for Amended Claim 1

also similarly applies to Amended Claim 8 with respect to Ryu et al.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner states that APA in view of Braxton renders the claim obvious. Amended Claim 1 teaches, in part, a mobile communication terminal having a hinge device for electrically connecting a main body and a folder of the terminal, the hinge device comprising a conductive hinge housing; a *conductive* coil spring; and a conductive contact pin, wherein *an electrical connection path between the main body and the folder through the hinge device includes the conductive coil spring and the conductive contact pin.*

APA discloses a mobile communication terminal 100 having a hinge device for connecting a main body 110 and a folder 150 of the terminal 100 (FIG.1 of the present application). APA fails to disclose a hinge device with limitations about a *conductive* coil spring and about *an electrical connection path between the main body and the folder through the hinge device includes the conductive coil spring and the conductive contact pin*, the limitations taught by Amended Claim 1.

Braxton discloses a housing assembly utilizing a heat shrinkable composite laminate (Title and Abstract). Braxton fails to disclose a hinge device with limitations about a *conductive* coil spring and about *an electrical connection path between the main body and the folder through the hinge device includes the conductive coil spring and the conductive contact pin*, the limitations taught by Amended Claim 1.

Clearly, Amended Claim 1 structurally differs from APA, Braxton, or the combination thereof.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the above rationale for Amended Claim 1 also similarly applies to Amended Claim 6 with respect to APA, Braxton, or the combination thereof.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the above rationale for Amended Claim 1 also similarly applies to Amended Claim 8 with respect to APA, Braxton, or the combination thereof.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims herein, namely Claims 1-8, are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul J. Farrell", is written over the typed name.

Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant

The Farrell Law Firm  
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard, Suite 701  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
(516) 228-3565 - Tel  
(516) 228-8475 - Fax

PJF/DGL/mk